

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No.: 11221-US-PA

REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Office Action further rejected claims 1-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Min (U.S. 5,072,134). The Office Action also rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yabe (U.S. 6,661,279). The Office Action objected claim 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants have cancelled claim 4 and amended claim 11 to improve clarity. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-3 and 5-11 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claim 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicants have rewritten claim 11 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 11 should be allowable.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Min. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Page 8 of 11

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No.: 11221-US-PA

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131. However, Min did not teach the technique feature of “a first phase internal voltage generator for providing a first internal voltage source upon receiving an external voltage source, a second phase internal voltage generator ... consumes relatively lower power than the first phase internal voltage generator; wherein as the second internal voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby” as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, *Min did not teach to cut off the first internal voltage source (output by main circuit 20 in Min) when the second internal voltage source (output by sub circuit 10 in Min) is steadied.* Therefore, Min did not teach each and every element of the claim, and did not anticipate claim 1 as well.

Accordingly, Min did not anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 is patentable over Min. Claims 2-3 and 5-7 are therefore patentable over Min as a matter of law.

For at least the same reason, Min did not anticipate claim 8 since Min did not teach the technique feature of “the first internal voltage source, supplied by the first phase internal voltage generator, being cut off when the second internal voltage source is steadied.” as claimed in claim 8.

Accordingly, Min did not anticipate claim 8, and claim 8 is patentable over Min. Claims 9 and 10 are therefore patentable over Min as a matter of law.

The Office Action further rejected claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yabe. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No.: 11221-US-PA

forth below.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. M.P.E.P. § 2131. However, Yabe did not teach the technique feature of "as the second internal voltage source ... is steadied, the first internal voltage source ... is cut off thereby" as claimed in claim 1. More specifically, *Yabe did not teach to cut off circuit 1 when output of circuit 2 is steadied*. Therefore, Yabe did not teach each and every element of the claim, and did not anticipate claim 1 as well.

Accordingly, Yabe did not anticipate claim 7 as a matter of law.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8 and 11 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-3, 5-7 and 9-10 patently define over the prior art as well.

The Office Action rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite.

Claim 4 has been cancelled to render the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,080
Docket No.: 11221-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-3 and 5-11 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Dec. 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jciigroup.com.tw
Usa@jciigroup.com.tw

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.